<u>REMARKS</u>

Claims 1-3, 5, and 8-14 remain pending in this application for which applicant seeks reconsideration.

Claims 1, 5, and 9-12 now stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Ramsay (USP 5,502,576) in view of Hussey (USP 5,826,269) and Lin (USP 7,130,864). Claim 13 now stands rejected under § 103(a) as unpatentable over Ramsay in view of Hussey, Lin, and Langseth (USP 6,694,316). Claim 3 now stands rejected under § 103(a) as unpatentable over Ramsay in view of Hussey, Lin, and Seder (USPGP 2002/0164053). Claims 2 and 8 now stand rejected under § 103(a) as unpatentable over Ramsay in view of Hussey, Lin, and Cullen (USP 5,893,908). Lastly, claim 14 now stands rejected under § 103(a) as unpatentable over Hussey in view of Abdel-Mottaleb (USP 6,285,995) and Lin.

The examiner is relying on Hussey for the proposition that sending the search result, namely an original electronic document data, via an email would have been obvious, and relying on Lin for the proposition that identifying the location of the searched document data in the email would have been obvious. Applicant disagrees with the examiner's assessment of the combinations urged by the examiner for the following reasons.

The pending claims call for setting, based on a user operation, whether or not a file corresponding to the searched original electronic document data is to be attached to an electronic mail. The file is not automatically sent after the search. When the file of the searched original electronic document data is not to be attached to the electronic mail, only the electronic mail notifying the result of the search is sent to the electronic mail address.

The examiner relies on the passage set forth in Hussey's column 7, lines 21-37, for the proposition that Hussey teaches setting whether to attach the file corresponding to the searched original electronic document data to an electronic mail. In this respect, the examiner asserts that Hussey teaches attaching and sending the file if it is located, or else no attachment is sent via the electronic mail. Indeed, what this means is that whether to send the attachment is not user selected, but done automatically independent of any user selection. That is, Hussey calls for always attaching the file if it is found.

In contrast, the pending claims call for setting whether to attach the searched data independent of the outcome. Here, even when the searched data is found, it will not be attached to the electronic mail if the user setting so dictates it. That is, the determination is made independent of the search result, whereas Hussey calls for sending the searched file

every time it is found.  Applicant thus submit that the combination, even if it were deemed proper for argument's sake, would not have disclosed or taught the claimed invention.

<u>Conclusion</u>

Applicant submits that the pending claims patentably distinguish over the applied references and are in condition for allowance.  Should the examiner have any issues concerning this reply or any other outstanding issues remaining in this application, applicant urges the examiner to contact the undersigned to expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

ROSSI, KIMMS & McDOWELL LLP

14 DECEMBER 2007               /Lyle Kimms 121407/
DATE                          LYLE KIMMS
                              REG. NO. 34,079 (RULE 34, WHERE APPLICABLE)

P.O. BOX 826
ASHBURN, VA 20146-0826
703-726-6020 (PHONE)
703-726-6024 (FAX)